

NOTE.—For the purpose of supplying a want very generally felt in the Parish, the Sermons of this series have been printed from shorthand notes, taken under the direction of certain members of the Vestry, who, alone, are answerable for all errors—the Rector kindly giving his consent, without assuming any responsibility—as the sermons preached in this church are not prepared with a view to publication.

[Second Edition.]

St. Clement's Pulpit.

Sermon Series.

No. 11.

Why am I not a Roman Catholic?

A Sermon preached (in substance) in St. Clement's Church,
Philadelphia,

At the Night Service on the 23d Sunday after Trinity,
November 16th, 1884.

By the Rev. FATHER CONVERS, S. S. J. E.

Assistant at St. Clement's Church, Philadelphia.

"One Faith." Eph. iv: 5.

Against this "one faith," of which S. Paul speaks, men may offend in two ways. One, by holding principles which do not result in "one faith" at all, but which result in differing and often contradictory doctrines. Men can follow a system which admits at one and the same time of opposing doctrines. For example, some men (most men that we meet here) hold to a system which says that the "one faith" is to be found by each man earnestly and prayerfully explain-

ing the Bible for himself. But this is a system which results in anything, except the "one faith." Imagine, if you can, a man who has pondered long upon his destiny, who is seeking light from heaven to guide him, and listening for God to speak; imagine such an one coming to these men with a soul's questionings: "O sirs, I have to die! What lies beyond? Sooner or later I *must* go. What shall I find? How shall I prepare myself for it? Tell me of the land beyond the grave." And the answer comes back, "Well, we are not all quite agreed about it. Some of us who discover the 'one faith' by each interpreting the Bible for himself, have concluded that there is only one place or state there, and that however much one may endure before, yet at last all will be in that one—heaven. But others of us think that there are two places or states, heaven and hell; and that at death you will go to the one or the other. But others of us think that there are three realms there, heaven, hell and the intermediate state. In short, we are not all agreed upon this matter." All this is said without a wish to mock the questioning soul. It may sound as if they were laughing at any one who asks, but nothing could be farther from their thoughts and wishes. Whatever may be said for this system, which is commonly called "Protestantism;" one thing is plain, it does not result in the "one faith." This then is one way of offending against it, by holding principles which give contradictory results at one and the same time.

The second way in which one may offend against the "one faith," is by holding principles resulting in one doctrine at one time and another contradictory one at a later time. If my system of religion be one which allows me to deny to-day what I asserted yesterday, I cannot wonder if people smile at it when it claims to be the "one faith." In the one stage or in the other, perhaps, it might be, but not in both at once. This change can come in two ways—one by cutting off or denying what was before deemed to be a true doctrine, and thus changing by *lessening* what was believed. The other by adding some new doctrine which contradicts

what was held before; and while at first sight this seems to increase what is to be believed, it does so at the expense of the old doctrines. Examples of these, both in the history of religious bodies and of individuals, are only too sadly common. And in opposition and contrast with these we have the "one faith,"—"one" in contemporary hearts and minds, "one" in successive ages as well. One to-day, to-morrow, and the day after; one in childhood, in youth, and in manhood; one for the rich and for the poor, one for the educated and for the uneducated; one because it is God's revelation to the whole world, our heavenly Father's message to the whole race.

That one message was brought by the one great teacher, Jesus Christ. He was not only the King to rule and protect His subjects, not only the Priest to offer the one great sacrifice for sins and to bring benediction and blessing to man, but also the one great Prophet, the Revealer, the Teacher who stood on the hills of Palestine and spoke words of instruction. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." (Heb. i: 1.) He who is both the unuttered Thought of God the Father, and the uttered Word, "spake as never man spake." "The desire of all nations" met, and satisfied that craving of the mind to *know* the secrets of Time and Eternity. And when the time came for Him to ascend He sent the Holy Ghost, "who," He said, addressing the Apostles, "shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." (S. John xiv: 26.) Or as he said again, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all Truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak, and He shall show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you." (S. John xvi: 12-14.) This language shows us that these words concern the Apostles personally, for the "you"

who are not able to bear now what remains to be said, are the ones to be guided into the whole truth; and are doubtless the Apostles personally. The Holy Spirit was theirs to bring back to memory what Christ had said, to guide them in their analysis of His great seed thoughts, in their combination of His various sayings, in their application of His methods to the Old Testament. They knew the whole truth, and to the end of this dispensation God's Church can never know more than S. John knew. You and I to-day cannot know more revealed truth than S. Paul. We may use other words, some perhaps which he would hardly understand; but there should be no difference except in words. Believe what the Apostles believed, believe it as they believed it, and thou shalt be saved. Christ told them to teach what they had heard, "What I tell you in darkness that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house tops." (S. Matt. x: 27.) "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (S. Matt. xxviii: 20.) This then is the "one faith." To bring the Apostles into it they received the Holy Spirit. Not that they alone had His gracious presence, and that the Church after the falling asleep of S. John, the last of that band, lost that gift. God forbid! The Holy Ghost was and is with His Church to *preserve* the "faith once delivered unto the Saints." Without His continual operation the fate of the Heaven born teaching of the Master would have been that of every human system. If you have ever seen a gallant ship with swelling sails sweeping grandly over the seas; and afterwards drifting, dismasted, abandoned by every human being, finally going to pieces on the rocks; then have you seen a picture of every human scheme, every human philosophy. Once successful, once so striking in its beauty, and impressive in its strength; afterwards, torn asunder, it goes to pieces and is forgotten. As the dark mass of a thunder storm may advance with imposing front, but on meeting a cross wind may be broken up and hurried hither and thither in little detached clouds, so earthly sys-

tems end—the power of the Holy Ghost has preserved the Gospel. The "one faith" is revealed by Christ, retaught and enforced and explained to the Apostles by the Paraclete, taught by the Apostles by word of mouth, written by some with inspired pen, handed on to coming ages embedded in tradition and in Scripture, guarded by the Holy Ghost. This is the eternal Gospel, the "deposit" which S. Timothy was to guard; whatever contradicted it was not to be received; no, not though an angel from Heaven came to vouch for that new thing. (Gal. i.) In words which many have considered to belong to S. Barnabas, and which are certainly old, "The rule of light is, 'Guard what thou hast received, adding nothing, withdrawing nothing.'" The power to hand it on unchanged is the endowment of the Church given by the Holy Ghost. This indwelling enables the "one faith" to resist the ravages of time. Therefore of old the one question was, what is the traditional doctrine? What have those before us taught?

It is this that I for one, brethren, believe. This revelation completely made of old to the Church and by her preserved and guarded, is that to which I bow my mind and believe. In the words of a theologian, "The Catholic revelation ought to be deemed to have been completed in the fullness of time by Christ, the Son of God, by Himself and by the Holy Spirit to the Apostles; so that not only is the new dispensation of a more perfect order, and a fuller revelation of God fancied by old and recent heretics excluded, but also in the present dispensation there has been no objective increase of the Catholic faith embraced in Holy Scripture and Apostolic tradition, nor should such be expected hereafter in the Church militant."

"This is the Catholic faith, which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved."

For one, what I believe is this traditional faith. Ever since, for example, S. Paul put into writing what he had believed in his heart, and taught his converts by his lips,—ever since S. Paul, I say, voiced the faith of the Church and

put forth what all believed, by writing with inspired pen, "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The Bread which we break is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x: 16.) Ever since S. Ignatius (dying perhaps ten years after S. John) speaks of "heretics" who "deny that the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ," has the real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Communion been a part of the "one faith." And I for my part bow down and worship my Saviour and my King hidden from my gaze on yonder altar under the Bread and Wine, because the "one faith" held from the first tells me of His presence. "From the beginning it was so."

But because I speak of the "one faith" to which nothing is to be added and from which nothing is to be taken, do I mean that there is nothing to be done but to repeat parrot-like the old phrases? Are we not to think of it, lest we should become heretics? Are we to have no life, no movement in theological thought? By no means. Most certainly we are to think it over, turn it from side to side, look at it from various points, note points of similarity and of contrast. Yet remember, all this can be done without any real increase of doctrine. All this may only be drawing out what is implicitly there already, and analyzing what was general. The task set the Church to solve by her theological thought would seem to have been chiefly threefold.

1. It translated into exact, technical, metaphysical language, what had been vague and popular. To illustrate,—the vague, popular truth was "Christ is God," hymns they sang to Christ as God, prayers they made to Christ as God, but theological metaphysics had to find, and did find, the long hard word "consubstantial" to put into the Creed to guard the old truth. These long, hard, unusual words are only instances where the old truth is packed for transportation. Because it is possible for a child to tell of his sickness in short words, and for the doctor to give an account of the same sickness and state *the very same facts touching it in*

hard Latin or Greek words which the poor child can not hope to understand, so can the Church in the untrained children of her Sunday-schools chaunt the "one faith" in short words, and in a meeting of her theologians utter the same "one faith" in long ones. But this is quite different from a change in the faith.

2. Theological thought can analyze a general statement, but while stating its parts, it does not say what is really new. It was all the while implicitly there. The old general statement was "Christ is man." It was no real increase to say as the Fathers said, "Christ has a real body and is no phantom." They said this against the Docetæ who taught that the body of Christ was only in seeming, not in reality. No real increase in what was believed when the Fathers said that Christ had a rational soul, against the heresy of Apollinaris. It was only drawing out by analysis the contents of the general statement held of old. Nor was it a real increase when the Church condemned those who taught that Christ had but one will, the Divine, and was without a human one. No, they say Christ is man; a man without a will would not be a man, but some uncouth, unknown sort of brute. Here it is plain that there was no new doctrine, but a mere analysis of the old.

3. The third chief work of theological thought was the combination of the old teaching. Here, too, there was no real increase. As a theologian publishes two volumes on the nature and being of God, and calls one "On God, one," and the other "On God, three in person," and just as these two titles cover all he says in his many pages, so God's Church holding ever the two thoughts, "there is one God" and also "the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are each divine," held ever all the Athanasian creed can say, all that theologians can say in big words and at great length on the Trinity.

Since the results of all this thought differ in words from the old expression, what tests have we that they differ only in words? There are two; of which the one will be more

applicable in later ages, while the other can be at once used. These two are; (1) that it is received throughout the whole of the Church; and (2) that it should show itself the continuation of the old traditional teaching and not contradictory to that teaching. Let me say freely that because I believe that Christ's promise will never fail and the "gates of hell shall not prevail against" His Church, therefore am I ready to receive what the whole Church may utter. Let Greek, Latin and Anglican communions be at one on a matter of doctrine, for one I receive it as the voice of the Body of Christ, as undoubted truth. This is one test. That the two tests should ever oppose one another is a state of affairs I cannot allow even for argument's sake; then too would the Church have failed. As well ask one to suppose there is no God. To these two tests come the oft repeated words of an old writer telling us that we find truth by finding what is held "always, everywhere and by all." Universal reception and traditional character.

But if the so-called explanation ever *contradicts* the older general statement, then we have what is false. The "one faith" handed down from age to age, once true, is true forever; what once was false, as contradicting it, is Satan's lie to the end of time. It is contradiction, not growth, that can turn a "no" into a "yes;" or make the false true. And, therefore, whoever holds to the old must reject the contradicting and opposing new. And therefore, do I, because I receive and believe this old traditional doctrine, find it impossible to stand side by side with the Ultramontanists, who to-day rule the Roman Catholic communion. Because I am a Catholic appealing to traditions; I cannot be a Romanist appealing to Papal *ex cathedra* utterances. This then, is the reply I make to the question "Why am I not a Roman Catholic?" It is a question which I answer at all because it has been asked in good faith. As God's priest I go into a house where lately death has been to take some loved one, and perhaps I make a prayer for the dead; and forthwith some one asks, "If you pray for the dead why are you not a

Roman Catholic?" Or some sin-laden soul is told of confession, and a neighbor may hear of the comfort and help that absolution was to them; and asks the question, "Why are you not a Roman Catholic if you tell your people to go to confession?" Or another is told to come and say their prayers in union with our Lord's act of pleading His sacrifice in the Holy Communion, and at once inquires, "If they hear mass, why are not they Papists?" Another hears a sermon on the Real Presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Communion, and puzzled asks in good faith, this same old question. Many an honest soul, longing for God's truth, eager to welcome sacramental teaching, shudders and draws back from that one prejudice, and I wish, if I can, to say a word in reply. Some angered say, "Go to Rome if you believe all that, it is where you belong."

And so believing I am to go to Rome? To a communion where one theologian cries, "Be a Roman Catholic, because we hold the old faith held in the past ages;" and before the words are uttered, another (Manning) jumps up with "The appeal to history is treason to the Church." One says "Be a Roman Catholic because it is the same as the faith of antiquity;" and Moehler, Newman, Oxenham, and others say "Be a Roman Catholic, because it is *not* the same as the faith of antiquity." In part it is these contradictions and the resulting uncertainty which bars me from the Roman Communion.

Much Roman doctrine must be defined clearly before one can embrace it. Many points are, according to the teaching of their divines, so open to various and opposite interpretations, that you cannot know what *is* the teaching.

Some so express themselves as to deliver as if "of the faith" what commands not the assent even of all their own theologians, and also contradicts antiquity. This very divergence makes it uncertain what is their "faith," as distinct from the teaching of a school of divines amongst them.

For example: most of us have a fairly clear idea of the ordinary teaching about Purgatory. But one writer tells us

that the Tridentine Creed lays down all that is necessary; and it only declares that there is a Purgatory, and the souls there can be helped. And another, Cardinal Wiseman, after taking time to consider, said that if a person held there would be suffering in the day of judgment, he satisfied the Roman doctrine. Are their not some of you who think of that great day as coming with suffering to those who meet it, even though its decision will assign those same persons to heaven? Did you know, or ever fancy for a moment, that you were holding what would come to Purgatory?

What position do they assign to S. Mary? Is it their teaching that while God could have given grace without S. Mary's intercession, yet he will not? That S. Mary is the neck if Christ is the head; and by this neck all the members are joined to the Saviour? That in the Holy Eucharist there is a presence of S. Mary as well as of Christ? Some of their theologians say this and more. They talk of the necessity of her intercessions as old writers did of the necessity of the Incarnation. And in connection with this, the Invocation of Saints. What is their doctrine? If one is simply to pray to God to give one a share in the prayers which the Saint, whether living or dead offer, the most exacting would have no fault to find. Even if they asked the departed Saints to pray for them and nothing more, that might not be so very terrible. But when one remembers some of the teaching about S. Mary, and hears, "O! thou co-Redemptress of mankind, save us," it goes so far beyond the minimum that does duty in some books.

Then, What is meant by the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin? Is it merely an early sanctification like the case of S. John Baptist or Jeremiah? Or is it a contradiction to the old doctrine of original sin, that every one, naturally the child of Adam, was so stained?

But, my brethren before I go on let me remind you of what we are too likely to forget. Controversy is apt, terribly apt, to make us forget or be shy to own that S. Mary is the Mother of God, and as such received all the filial love which

her perfect Son, could pay. Remember it is heresy to deny her that title,—a general council settled that forever. In her arms the Christ child nestled, from her lips came the earliest kiss of adoring love that greeted Him, into her eyes He gazed with love. Oh, sons of holy and loving mothers! don't you know what it was like? Love for her on our part is but following Christ's example. Any one who wishes to imitate Him is by that fact *bound* to give to the Mother of God "all but adoring love." But to return:

There is a more fundamental uncertainty than any of these. What do they mean by *ex cathedra*, when they say that the Pope is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*, or officially? What makes it an official utterance? Does it mean only the difference all would make between a teacher in a public discourse, and some casual remarks of the same man in playful conversation? None, so far as I know, say *this*. Some say to be official it must be addressed to the whole Church. But why a smaller body should not need, and have given to them the infallible truth, they do not explain. Others say that it is God's infallible truth, when it has complied with certain forms used in Rome, and, as one, has been tacked on to the door of S. Peter's Church. I don't know how many minutes it must stay there to change it from being the thesis of a private doctor, to being infallible truth. God's truth to hang on a thing of that kind! Some say that it is not *ex cathedra* unless he in it denounces hell-fire to all who reject it. Others, unless the Pope before putting it forth, has consulted his advisers. Some dispute as to how many must be consulted—are two Cardinals enough or not? Some say that *ex cathedra* utterances are limited to those which define a doctrine to be believed; others say that they extend to those who point out a doctrine to be rejected as false. Some say that the marks are so few and simple that any one can settle the question; others, that the question is so hard as to require trained theologians. If we take one or two documents we have a specimen. Pius IX put forth what is called "the Syllabus"—a collection of condem-

nations made by him at various times. This, one Roman theologian, as Manning, holds to be infallible as being *ex cathedra*. Another, as Newman, denies it. So a Roman Catholic pressed in controversy can evade one thing after another by a mere change in his definition of *ex cathedra*. But it is a point on which they must be clear. If the one organ for uttering God's infallible truth be an *ex cathedra* decision of the Pope, the one hope of knowing what is true is by settling what marks out such decisions from others. To omit doing this, is to throw each on his own opinion in the matter, and so to agree with the private opinion of Protestants exercised on Papal bulls, etc., rather than on the Bible. To say, "the infallible truth lies in the *ex cathedra* utterances of the Pope," and when we ask, "which are the *ex cathedra* utterances?" to receive no answer, is to be mocked; to have a dozen different ones is to be told, "guess which is the right one." What is their system?

There are many men who base their opposition to Rome on certain points of discipline, as some who object to the enforced Easter confession. It does seem absurd, at first sight, to *require* the remedy for mortal sin of all yearly, even if they are only in venial sin; yet when one remembers how long a year is, and the great likelihood of a deadly sin in that time, it is not practically absurd, however it may be in theory. For my own part, I am glad to belong to a communion where confession is not enforced, believing that voluntary character helps to make our confessions good ones.

Another, more serious, is the refusal of the chalice in the Holy Communion to the laity. With many a Roman Catholic I can and do wish its restoration. But still in itself it would be no sufficient reason against inter-communion.

Intrusion of its Bishops into the sees of others, an act of schism, setting up altar against altar. Unanswerable as is the plea that our first Bishop in this land was consecrated prior to the first Roman one, and that any subsequent Bishops *should* have entered the communion of the national ones, that

ecclesiastical relations should conform to political relations, yet considering the shortness of this priority it is reduced to a small matter. If there were nothing more than these and such like at issue, it would not be worth while standing out. But when there is the uncertainty of which I have spoken and also this further great principle of contradicting antiquity, then one has two reasons for that most sad thing—refusal to stand side by side with any who would serve their and our common Lord.

Sweeping down the ages comes the stream of Catholic tradition bearing the doctrines of revealed truth, and also bringing some other statements which are certain and true, although not "of the faith." To these certainties, as held by antiquity and taught to us, the Roman Catholic Church of to-day gives a flat denial; nay, more, it raises into articles of faith these denials. As one loyal to antiquity, I cannot stand side by side with her. Only one instance have I time to give.

I mean that mass of doctrine which clusters around the Pope, teaching his infallibility in doctrine and morals apart from the Church's consent and also his supremacy as matter of Divine right.

His supremacy over all Christendom, as a matter of divine right, is one which contradicts antiquity. When one is asked to believe as an article of faith (to reject which is to be damned), what contradicts the voice of the Church of centuries; to hear a fragment of the Church of the nineteenth century as against that of ages past, a Catholic has no choice. "The old is true, the new is false." One will "hear the Church." What do I mean by that? Well, I mean among other things, the first general council giving to the Bishop of Alexandria certain powers because the Bishop of Rome has the same, quite silent as to any universal jurisdiction of the latter which is of Divine right. I mean, among other things, the second general council, that of Constantinople, called by the emperor, attended by no western Bishop, presided over by S. Melitius while he was excommunicated by

Rome—think of it! a council held outside the communion of Rome, but nevertheless œcumenical—forbidding all Bishops from going beyond their own diocese, or from interfering in others; and decreeing that “the Bishop of Constantinople has the prerogative of honor next after the Bishop of Rome, for it (Constantinople) is new Rome,” thus basing the rank of Bishops on the political position of his see city, and not on Divine right.

I mean among other things, the Church of North Africa in Council at Carthage excommunicating throughout Africa any who should “appeal to parts beyond seas,” that is to Rome; and sending a letter to the Pope to tell in plain language that they would not suffer his insolence—a letter signed by S. Augustine of Hippo.

I mean among other things, the Third General Council laying down the principle that “none of the Bishops should invade any other province which has not heretofore from the beginning been under the hand of himself or his predecessors; or if any should so occupy one or forcibly subject it to himself, let him make personal restitution, lest the Statutes of the Fathers should be violated, and lest the pride of power should creep in under this pretext of a sacred office and thus we might unknowingly and gradually lose that freedom which Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour of all men obtained for us with His precious blood and bestowed upon us.”

I mean among other things, the Fourth General Council saying “that the Fathers properly gave precedence to the throne of old Rome because it was the imperial city.” When the Council of Chalcedon thus attributed the ecclesiastical rank of Rome to her political position, it was either right or wrong. If right, then the modern assertion of the divine right of Rome falls to the ground. If wrong, the Council erred touching a matter of “the faith” or else the Roman primacy is not a matter of faith, but only of history. The Council’s decrees are the standard of orthodoxy in the Roman Church as with us; and so we are shut in to the conclusion either

they were right, or the matter is not “of the faith; conclusions alike fatal to Ultramontane teaching.”

I mean, among other things, the Fifth General Council contemptuously disregarding the letters of the Pope to it, and taking its own path regardless of his helpless vacillations on the doctrinal issue.

I mean the Sixth General Council anathematizing Honorius, Bishop of Rome, as a heretic; an anathema repeated by many a subsequent Pope, which was for a long time in the Roman Breviary. But no fragment of a sermon could hold all which antiquity testifies as to the human origin of Papal supremacy. Only a volume could exhaust the difference between Rome of to-day under Ultramontane sway, and the past on this.

But let me say this, not with the bitterness of controversy, or even the excitement of discussion, but with my heart filled with sorrow. To see the largest body of Christians in this world cutting loose from antiquity can only be an agony. To see those from whom we would naturally look for help in the great struggle of to-day, with unbelief and disbelief, cutting one by one the strands which moor their ship to the old, is not a thing to rejoice over, as if it were a help to us to see a fellow Christian making a false step. To find that because one holds to antiquity, he is therefore the further from the love of such men as some Roman Catholics are, is only grief and pain.

The dear Lord knelt down in His last night on earth, and clasping His hands prayed with agony in His voice—an agony which told that He could foresee a future so unlike His longing—that they “all might be one.” Each and every age to be one in the “one faith” as well as all one at any given time. Realize what that means; the Saviour of the World, yours and mine, pleading for unity. And are you to exult in the thought that there is aught to part any of His followers? He prayed for it in order “that the world may believe.” You, whose heart is sad with the memory of the disbelief of to-day, weep over its cause. You who would

fain see heathens afar and sceptics at home (in your own family perhaps) converted and pardoned, can you do less than the Christ did? PRAY. Besiege Heaven by your prayers. God is strong and can turn the tide on which they are drifting. Time was when they were so unlike what they are to-day. God's strong hand can change it. Ask Him. It may be we ask a miracle, it may be we ask what we shall never see; but at least we pray as Christ prayed. For His prayer was answered so far as God's share in the answer is concerned—He prayed that as the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one, so should Christians be one. But their unity of essence was one which at times looked to men like diversity. Go to Jordan at the baptism; the voice from above told of the Father, the descending form told of the Holy Ghost, and the human form in the waters of the river told of the Son and to men's eyes they seemed as if three separate and distinct substances, while we believe them one. It looked as if they were three Gods. Their unity seemed broken. And so, remember we, too, are one by the sacramental union of each with God. Christ prayed for an inner unity, working out into a visible unity, and so influencing men; never forget we *are* brothers; pray as such. Parted, but brothers still, infinitely nearer to them than to any body of Christians in this land; one with them in our faith in the three great mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement; one in holding pardon in Baptism and Absolution; one in holding the real presence of our Lord God and Saviour in the Sacrament of the Altar; one in holding It as the pleading of and applying the merits of the Sacrifice of Mount Calvary. But I can't go on with the happy task of dwelling on our common faith. Never forget it when you come to God. Remembering it, kneel down and pray: "O Lord, Jesus Christ, who didst say to thine Apostles, 'Peace I leave with you, my peace give I unto you,' regard not our sins but the faith of Thy Church, and grant unto her that peace and unity which is agreeable to Thy holy will, who with the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost, livest and reignest forever and ever. Amen."